

## **ADDENDUM NO. 1**

### **TO SPEC. 04-201**

#### **Professional Consultant Services for Updating a Pavement Management System**

Proposal submittal deadline shall remain the same: on or before noon, Wednesday, August 11, 2004 in the office of the Purchasing Agent, Suite 200, K Street Complex, 440 S. 8<sup>th</sup> St., Lincoln, NE 68508.

Please note the following change:

Currently reads: 11.7.3.1 A sample of a progress report is attached in Appendix C

Shall read: 11.7.3.1 The progress report format will be developed by the selected consultant and approved by the City prior to work beginning.

QUESTION: I have assumed the City has the Cartegraph software in place, if so what version and modules do you have, and how long has it been installed?

ANSWER: Yes, Cartegraph Software, version 6/oracle, has been installed for approximately two (2) years. We have the Pavement View Plus module.

QUESTION: Is it the City's intention to have the Cartegraph system evaluated and potentially replaced, or do you wish to keep it and upgrade it and the way it is used?

ANSWER: It is our desire to use Cartegraph and not replace it. The consultant will determine how best to use the system in order to obtain optimum results.

QUESTION: Paragraph 8.3.3 indicated roadway mileage by functional class was available, but did not have any values provided.

ANSWER: There are 2,790 lane miles of streets, which the City does not have them broken out by functional class. Arterial Streets are defined by City Ordinance. These determinations may be part of the scope of services with the selected firm. Refer to section 8 in the RFP for additional information.

QUESTION: 8.3.2.2 referenced "Permits Plus" Am I correct in assuming this is another software module the City has?

ANSWER: Permits Plus is a separate software package and separate of Pavement Management.

QUESTION: One of the evaluation criteria was timeliness and ability to meet milestones, however no milestones were provided. What are the key dates to meet?

ANSWER: It is the desire of the City to have the system implemented within one year or less. The milestones will be negotiated with the selected firm.

QUESTION: How many miles of roads are rigid (PCC)? How many are flexible (HMAC)?

ANSWER: The City does not have this information and will expect the selected consultant to obtain the information.

QUESTION: We have recommended for all the projects we have done, to survey only the outside lane (both directions for divided roadways). Does the City of Lincoln wish to survey all lanes or are the outside lanes adequate for their network level survey?

ANSWER: It is expected the Consultant will make recommendations for the City to consider in making this determination.

QUESTION: Section 8.2.3 (8.3.3 in the RFP) of the RFP appears to be incomplete. What is the rest of it supposed to say?

ANSWER: See first portion of this Addendum.

QUESTION: Can we be sent the four evaluation forms referenced in section 8.3.1 to get a better understanding of the current procedures?

ANSWER: Yes, see attached.

QUESTION: Section 8.3.1.1 (8.3.2.1 under 8.3.1 in the RFP) mentions "base condition". Was this determined through geotechnical testing or Falling Weight Deflectometer testing? Are these services required under this contract?

ANSWER: No, determined by visual inspection.

QUESTION: We primarily use a profiler to determine ride quality. How was ride quality determined in the past surveys (subjective, other equipment, etc.)?

ANSWER: Subjective

QUESTION: Is there any additional right-of-way information that the City would like collected besides Curb & Gutter? (Inlets, sidewalks, guard rails, signage, etc.)

ANSWER: Not at this time.

QUESTION: Section 8.3.2.2 of the RFP also appears to be incomplete. The recommended links include the GIS, permits, plus....?

ANSWER: Should read Permits Plus software. Refer to section 9 for computer technical information.

QUESTION: Our professionals are experts with Oracle, SQL Server and Access DB applications. Can SQL Server be used instead of Oracle? (The costs are significantly lower and the two applications have all of the same requirements that our automated system requires to function. We don't usually require the higher features in Oracle)

ANSWER: Refer to section 9. Oracle.

QUESTION: Section 10.1.1.1 says gather all roadway-related data. Is there a list or existing database available to review?

ANSWER: Yes, it is available by contacting Steven Faust, Rehabilitation Coordinator at 402/441-8413 or fax: 402/441-6576 or email: [sfaust@lincoln.ne.gov](mailto:sfaust@lincoln.ne.gov) You must have ACCESS software to open the files.

QUESTION: What modifications are desired to the CarteGraph system? What are the current deficiencies that have caused the City to look at other possible systems?

ANSWER: Consultant to make recommendations.

All other terms and conditions to remain unchanged.

Dated this 3rd<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2004.

Purchasing Department

Mary L. Matson  
Assistant Purchasing Agent

# ASPHALT SURFACE RESIDENTIAL STREET

LANE MILE SURVEY NO. \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

STREET \_\_\_\_\_ FROM \_\_\_\_\_ TO \_\_\_\_\_

LENGTH \_\_\_\_\_ WIDTH \_\_\_\_\_ SQ. YARDS \_\_\_\_\_

ASPHALT TYPE \_\_\_\_\_ CURB TYPE \_\_\_\_\_

YEAR CONSTRUCTED OR RESURFACED \_\_\_\_\_ BASE TYPE \_\_\_\_\_

RATING  
POINTS

SURFACE CONDITION	Pavement smoothness very satisfactory. No surface failure	*Occasional spot failures, spalling, roughness or rutting. Correctable	Frequent spot surface failures. Rough surface in need of heavy maintenance. Traffic must reduce speed	Severe surface failure. Traffic speeds reduced substantially by surface condition	
	0 1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10 10	
MAINTENANCE ECONOMY	No expenditures other than strictly routine.	Some expenditures, but not extensive. Some patching required annually	Considerable expenditures necessary. Considerable or continued patching necessary	Excessive expenditures. Great amount of patching necessary. Road must be rebuilt, not repaired. Temp. maintenance only	
	0 1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10 10	
BASE FAILURE	Rare situations of base failure	Occasional evidence of minor base failure. Fully correctable by spot repairs	Frequent evidence of base failure, correctable with heavy maintenance. Traffic speeds reduced somewhat	Sever base failure throughout section. Extremet wash-board condition. Need reconstruction. Traffic speeds reduced substantially	
	0 1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10 10	
OVERALL RIDING QUALITY	No driver strain with normal conditions. Crown & transitions provide excellent vehicle operation, smooth riding. No width or clearance restriction	Moderate driver strain due to minor geometric deficiencies. Good riding comfort	Considerable driver strain due to geometric deficiencies. Vehicle operation affected. Some riding discomfort	Server driver strain due to geometric deficiencies. Substantial riding discomfort	
	0 1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10 10	
CURB CONDITION	Uniform flow lines and uniform curb cross- section. No surface deterioration	Uniform flow lines and only moderate cross-section damage. Only spot deterioration easily repaired	Moderate flow line and cross- section damage. Deterioration of gutter surface and curb face more frequent	Flow lines disrupted and frequent damage to cross-section. Gutter and curb face surfaces, deteriorated frequently.	
	0 1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10 10	

Condition Total \_\_\_\_\_

## TRAFFIC CONSIDERATIONS

TRAFFIC	Low Volume Residential (Cul-de- sac/Dead-end Sts.)	Typical Residential	Collector	Bus Route/Collector	
	0 1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10 10	

Traffic Total \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: Higher Total Points Indicates Overall Poor Condition

Indicate Type of Maintenance or Deficiencies

\_\_\_\_\_ Crackseal \_\_\_\_\_ Surface Patching \_\_\_\_\_ Design Consideration (See Remarks)

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

**CONCRETE PAVEMENT  
RESIDENTIAL STREETS**  
LANE MILE SURVEY NO. \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
EVALUATED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

STREET \_\_\_\_\_ FROM \_\_\_\_\_ TO \_\_\_\_\_  
 LENGTH \_\_\_\_\_ WIDTH \_\_\_\_\_ SQ. YARDS \_\_\_\_\_  
 ASPHALT TYPE \_\_\_\_\_ CURB TYPE \_\_\_\_\_  
 YEAR CONSTRUCTED OR RESURFACED \_\_\_\_\_ BASE TYPE \_\_\_\_\_

RATING  
POINTS

SLAB SURFACE CONDITION	Slab smoothness very satisfactory. No surface failure	*Occasional, spalling, delamination or exposed steel. Correctable with minor maint. (partial depth patches).	Frequent spalling, delamination or exposed steel. Surface rough w/exposed aggregate some long & trans. cracking	Severe spalling, delamination or exposed steel. Failure thru entire depth of slab. Extensive cracking long. & trans.	
	0      1      2	3      4      5	6      7      8	9      10      10	
MAINTENANCE ECONOMY	No expenditures other than strictly routine.	Some expenditures, but not extensive. Some patching required annually	Considerable expenditures necessary. Considerable or continued patching necessary	Excessive expenditures. Great amount of patching necessary. Road must be rebuilt, not repaired. Temp. maintenance only	
	0      1      2	3      4      5	6      7      8	9      10      10	
JOINT CONDITION	Joints well sealed no differential settlement. No cracking long. or trans.	Minor sealing req., its. uniform. Minor cracking along edge of jts. Occasional long. or trans. crack. Minor diff. settlement along jts. Correctable w/minor cleaning and resealing	Extensive sealing req. Frequent cracking & spalls along jts. frequent working cracks. Diff. settlement along cracks and jts. Correctable w/major joint repairing & resealing	Extensive jt. deterioration major spalling & failure in most joints. Excessive diff. settlement. Must e rebuilt.	
	0      1      2	3      4      5	6      7      8	9      10      10	
OVERALL RIDING QUALITY	No driver strain with normal conditions. Crown & transitions provide excellent vehicle operation, smooth riding. No width or clearance restriction	Moderate driver strain due to minor geometric deficiencies. Good riding comfort	Considerable driver strain due to geometric deficiencies. Vehicle operation affected. Some riding discomfort	Server driver strain due to geometric deficiencies. Substantial riding discomfort	
	0      1      2	3      4      5	6      7      8	9      10      10	
CURB CONDITION	Uniform flow lines and uniform curb cross-section. No surface deterioration	Uniform flow lines and only moderate cross-section damage. Only spot deterioration easily repaired	Moderate flow line and cross-section damage. Deterioration of gutter surface and curb face more frequent	Flow lines disrupted and frequent damage to cross-section. Gutter and curb face surfaces, deteriorated frequently.	
	0      1      2	3      4      5	6      7      8	9      10      10	

Condition Total \_\_\_\_\_

TRAFFIC CONSIDERATIONS

TRAFFIC	Low Volume Residential (Cul-de-sac/Dead-end Sts.)	Typical Residential	Collector	Bus Route/Collector	
	0      1      2	3      4      5	6      7      8	9      10      10	

Traffic Total \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: Higher Total Points Indicates Overall Poor Condition

Indicate Type of Maintenance or Deficiencies

\_\_\_\_\_ Crackseal      \_\_\_\_\_ Surface Patching      \_\_\_\_\_ Design Consideration (See Remarks)

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

**ASPHALT SURFACE  
ARTERIAL STREET**  
LANE MILE SURVEY NO. \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
EVALUATED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

STREET \_\_\_\_\_ FROM \_\_\_\_\_ TO \_\_\_\_\_  
 LENGTH \_\_\_\_\_ WIDTH \_\_\_\_\_ SQ. YARDS \_\_\_\_\_  
 ASPHALT TYPE \_\_\_\_\_ CURB TYPE \_\_\_\_\_  
 YEAR CONSTRUCTED OR RESURFACED \_\_\_\_\_ BASE TYPE \_\_\_\_\_

RATING  
POINTS

SURFACE CONDITION	Pavement smoothness very satisfactory. No surface failure	*Occasional spot failures, spalling, roughness or rutting. Correctable	Frequent spot surface failures. Rough surface in need of heavy maintenance. Traffic must reduce speed	Severe surface failure. Traffic speeds reduced substantially by surface condition	
	0      1      2	3      4      5	6      7      8	9      10      10	
MAINTENANCE ECONOMY	No expenditures other than strictly routine.	Some expenditures, but not extensive. Some patching required annually	Considerable expenditures necessary. Considerable or continued patching necessary	Excessive expenditures. Great amount of patching necessary. Road must be rebuilt, not repaired. Temp. maintenance only	
	0      1      2	3      4      5	6      7      8	9      10      10	
BASE FAILURE	Rare situations of base failure	Occasional evidence of minor base failure. Fully correctable by spot repairs	Frequent evidence of base failure, correctable with heavy maintenance. Traffic speeds reduced somewhat	Sever base failure throughout section. Extremet wash-board condition. Need reconstruction. Traffic speeds reduced substantially	
	0      1      2	5      6      7	9      10      11	13      14      15	
OVERALL RIDING QUALITY	No driver strain with normal conditions. Crown & transitions provide excellent vehicle operation, smooth riding. No width or clearance restriction	Moderate driver strain due to minor geometric deficiencies. Good riding comfort	Considerable driver strain due to geometric deficiencies. Vehicle operation affected. Some riding discomfort	Server driver strain due to geometric deficiencies. Substantial riding discomfort	
	0      1      2	3      4      5	6      7      8	9      10      10	
CURB CONDITION	Uniform flow lines and uniform curb cross- section. No surface deterioration	Uniform flow lines and only moderate cross-section damage. Only spot deterioration easily repaired	Moderate flow line and cross- section damage. Deterioration of gutter surface and curb face more frequent	Flow lines disrupted and frequent damage to cross-section. Gutter and curb face surfaces, deteriorated frequently.	
	0      1      2	3      4      5	6      7      8	9      10      10	

Condition Total \_\_\_\_\_

TRAFFIC CONSIDERATIONS

TRAFFIC VOLUME (ADT)	Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	
	0 - 3,000 ADT .....0-2 Points      10,000 - 20,000 ADT ..... 6-8 Points 3,000 - 10,000 ADT .....3-5 Points      20,000 & UP .....9-10 Points	

Traffic Total \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: Higher Total Points Indicates Overall Poor Condition

Surface Condition

\*Indicate Type of Maintenance or Deficiencies:

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Design Considerations (See Remarks)    2. \_\_\_\_\_ Storm Sewer    3. \_\_\_\_\_ Base Repair  
 4. \_\_\_\_\_ Petromat    5. \_\_\_\_\_ Slurry Seal    7. \_\_\_\_\_ Shoulder Work    8. \_\_\_\_\_ Patching

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

# CONCRETE PAVEMENT ARTERIAL STREETS

LANE MILE SURVEY NO. \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

STREET \_\_\_\_\_ FROM \_\_\_\_\_ TO \_\_\_\_\_

LENGTH \_\_\_\_\_ WIDTH \_\_\_\_\_ SQ. YARDS \_\_\_\_\_

ASPHALT TYPE \_\_\_\_\_ CURB TYPE \_\_\_\_\_

YEAR CONSTRUCTED OR RESURFACED \_\_\_\_\_ BASE TYPE \_\_\_\_\_

RATING  
POINTS

SLAB SURFACE CONDITION	Slab smoothness very satisfactory. No surface failure	*Occasional, spalling, delamination or exposed steel. Correctable with minor maint. (partial depth patches).	Frequent spalling, delamination or exposed steel. Surface rough w/exposed aggregate some long & trans. cracking	Severe spalling, delamination or exposed steel. Failure thru entire depth of slab. Extensive cracking long. & trans.	
	0    1    2	3    4    5	6    7    8	9    10    10	
MAINTENACE ECONOMY	No expenditures other than strictly routine.	Some expenditures, but not extensive. Some patching required annually	Considerable expenditures necessary. Considerable or continued patching necessary	Excessive expenditures. Great amount of patching necessary. Road must be rebuilt, not repaired. Temp. maintenance only	
	0    1    2	3    4    5	6    7    8	9    10    10	
JOINT CONDITION	Joints well sealed no differential settlement. No cracking long. or trans.	Minor sealing req., its. uniform. Minor cracking along edge of jts. Occasional long. or trans. crack. Minor diff. settlement along jts. Correctable w/minor cleaning and resealing	Extensive sealing req. Frequent cracking & spalls along jts. frequent working cracks. Diff. settlement along cracks and jts. Correctable w/major joint repairing & resealing	Extensive jt. deterioration major spalling & failure in most joints Excessive diff. settlement. Must e rebuilt.	
	0    1    2    3	4    5    6    7	8    9    10    11	12    13    14    15	
OVERALL RIDING QUALITY	No driver strain with normal conditions. Crown & transitions provide excellent vehicle operation, smooth riding. No width or clearance restriction	Moderate driver strain due to minor geometric deficiencies. Good riding comfort	Considerable driver strain due to geometric deficiencies. Vehicle operation affected. Some riding discomfort	Server driver strain due to geometric deficiencies. Substantial riding discomfort	
	0    1    2	3    4    5	6    7    8	9    10    10	
CURB CONDITION	Uniform flow lines and uniform curb cross-section. No surface deterioration	Uniform flow lines and only moderate cross-section damage. Only spot deterioration easily repaired	Moderate flow line and cross-section damage. Deterioration of gutter surface and curb face more frequent	Flow lines disrupted and frequent damage to cross-section. Gutter and curb face surfaces, deteriorated frequently.	
	0    1    2	3    4    5	6    7    8	9    10    10	

Condition Total \_\_\_\_\_

## TRAFFIC CONSIDERATIONS

TRAFFIC VOLUME (ADT)	Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	
	0 - 3,000 ADT .....0-2 Points      10,000 - 20,000 ADT ..... 6-8 Points 3,000 - 10,000 ADT .....3-5 Points      20,000 & UP .....9-10 Points	

Traffic Total \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: Higher Total Points Indicates Overall Poor Condition  
Surface Condition

\*Indicate Type of Maintenance or Deficiencies:

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Design Considerations (See Remarks)    2. \_\_\_\_\_ Storm Sewer    3. \_\_\_\_\_ Base Repair
4. \_\_\_\_\_ Petromat    5. \_\_\_\_\_ Slurry Seal    6. \_\_\_\_\_ Shoulder Work    7. \_\_\_\_\_ Patching

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_